

By-Hale, James R.

Appendix G. Basic Training Model for the ComField Practicum.

Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-8-9022

Pub Date Oct 68

Contract-OEC-O-8-089022(010)

Note-7p.; Appendix G in A Competency Based, Field Centered, Systems Approach to Elementary Teacher Education; Final Report. Vol. II, p116-122.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.45

Descriptors-*Course Descriptions, Curriculum Development, Evaluation, *Models, *Practicums, *Systems Approach, Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Educators

Identifiers-*ComField Model Teacher Education Program, Joint Inquiry

The practicum for the ComField Model Teacher Education Program is based on Joint Inquiry, a process for systematically improving instruction in which the instructional manager (individual in charge of instruction, in this case a student teacher), or I.M., and the trainer (teacher educator) together attempt to solve a professional problem. Joint Inquiry is implemented through a five-phase cycle (planning, observation, analysis, strategy, and conference) related to seven underlying principles: (1) The I.M. and the trainer jointly share understanding of the problem situation. (2) Shared understanding demands full exchange of information. (3) The I.M. must attempt to achieve his goals, not the trainer's. (4) There will be no learning unless the I.M. makes a provisional try, i.e., exposes his behavior. (5) After making a provisional try, the I.M. must receive information about his performance, not about his personality. (6) The I.M. must receive information about the effects of his performance. (7) The I.M. performance indicates the order in which desired changes are to be accomplished. Transcripts of the teaching act plus records from planning sessions and conferences serve as a basis for further counseling and referral. An evaluation team consisting of a group of trainers determines when the I.M. has completed the practicum. (This document and SP 002 155-SP 002 180 comprise the appendixes for the ComField Model Teacher Education Program Specifications in SP 002 154.) (Author/SG)

ED0 26312

APPENDIX G--BASIC TRAINING MODEL FOR
THE COMFIELD PRACTICUM

James R. Hale

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Submitted for a Consortium of
Institutions and Agencies by the
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
400 Lindsay Building
710 S. W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

SP 00 2161

BASIC TRAINING MODEL FOR THE COMFIELD PRACTICUM

James R. Hale

The general purpose of the ComField practicum ought to be to enable the Student Instructional Manager (hereinafter called the I.M.) to demonstrate continued growth in specific competencies. The Basic Training Model for the Practicum ought to provide for the I.M. to demonstrate such growth and to enable the Trainer of the Student Instructional Manager (hereinafter called the Trainer) to evaluate such growth.

Demonstration of Continued Growth

The model for enabling the I.M. to demonstrate continued growth in specific competencies is based on a Joint Inquiry¹ process. Joint Inquiry is a process for systematically analyzing and improving instruction in which two professional people, the I.M. and the Trainer, are attempting to solve a professional problem. Seven principles which relate to this Joint Inquiry process are described below.

First, the Trainer and the I.M. must develop a shared understanding which combines how each sees the situation. This means establishing a different kind of relationship than we often do. The usual way of conceiving of the relationship between supervisor and supervisee is that the Trainer tries to change the I.M. Instead, both parties should take joint action to solve the problem. In other words, they become partners conducting an inquiry into a problem which an I.M. wishes to solve. It's a special kind of problem and the solution requires increased competence on the part of the I.M. If he solves the problem, he has gained increased competence to meet with new problems. This requires a joint sharing of the views about the nature of the problem and the steps to be taken in the solution.

A difference between the actions taken by the I.M. and what the Trainer would have done should be approached by creating a shared understanding of their meaning. One needs to get a shared understanding of what each thought should be accomplished, the predictions each was making, the explanations each made about the current

¹Lecture by John L. Wallen at the Clinical Supervision Institute, Portland State College, Portland, Oregon, 1965.

situation and the facts involved. Shared understanding results when each person indicates his objectives, opinions and facts available at the particular time. Shared understanding between two people is limited by the amount of firsthand experience they have in common. It is one thing to be told something; it is another thing to experience it. To the extent that two people can experience the same situation, they communicate better.

Second, shared understanding requires that full information be exchanged. But full information will be exchanged only in a trusting relationship. Therefore, unless the I.M. feels safe and free to be himself, to talk about his inadequacies, the places he wants to change, or his weaknesses, there isn't going to be a full sharing of information. Thus, you will not get a shared understanding.

The third principle is that the I.M. must be attempting to achieve his goals, not the Trainer's. It could be said that the I.M. is always attempting to achieve his goals. If, however, he is working to achieve goals set for him by the Trainer, his true goals are to please the Trainer to avoid disapproval. In short, the learning process becomes one of learning how to get along with the Trainer, not of learning how to solve problems with increased competencies. Therefore, one should start from the basis that the I.M. is always going to be working to solve his own problems, to achieve his own goals. The Trainer should find out what they are, and if he can, influence them in a more helpful direction. That's as far as he can go. This principle implies that the I.M. should help decide the standards of effective performance in advance. His reward will come from accomplishment rather than general praise from an external source. In short, he's attempting to meet his own goals, and because he has helped arrive at the criteria as to when they are met, the behavior will more likely be internalized.

Fourth, there will be no learning unless the I.M. makes a provisional try. That is, he must expose his behavior. He must do something. He must provide firsthand data for inquiry into the problem he is attempting to solve. Teachers frequently ask for demonstration lessons from a supervisor. Demonstrations can be useful; but if the teacher wants to change his own behavior, he will have to try something himself to see the results. In short, he must make a provisional try.

Fifth, after the I.M. has made a provisional try, he must receive information about what he did. He must receive information about his actual behavior, about performance. The Trainer does not provide him with vague information about his personality. One doesn't say, "You're going to need more of a sense of humor."

Develop a sense of humor." Information about his actions may be through a transcript, a tape recording or a videotape; but in any case, it is a record of his actions. He can see it as others do instead of through the filter of what he intended to accomplish.

Sixth, in addition to performance data, the I.M. must receive data on the results of his performance, about its effect. Performance data tells him what he did; effect data tells him what effect is produced. The Trainer lets him steer his behavior by the consequences he produces. The I.M. should help decide himself what kinds of information he wants to guide his improvement. Whatever it is, he needs to know not only what he did but its effect.

The final principle is that of successive approximation. In applying the principle of successive approximation, one does not try to accomplish the entire change of performance at one time or in one step. Rather, it finds the logic in the performance indicating the order in which the desired changes are to be accomplished. The Trainer and I.M. have the same objectives, are working toward the same goal, and jointly decide what should be accomplished first, second, third and so on.

These seven principles of the Joint Inquiry process constitute the theoretical basis of the model for enabling the I.M. to demonstrate continued growth in specific competencies.

The practice of Joint Inquiry is implemented through the use of a cycle which includes five phases: planning, observation, analysis, strategy and conference.¹ Each of these phases in the cycle serves a definite purpose and is related to the seven principles of the Joint Inquiry process in the following way:

<u>Cycle</u>	<u>Principles</u>
Planning- - - - -	Develop shared understanding Exchange full information Identify I.M.'s goals
Observation - - - - -	Make provisional try Obtain performance data
Analysis - - - - -	Examine performance data Determine effect data

¹Lecture by Morris Cogan at the Clinical Supervision Institute, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1964.

Strategy - - - - - Order possible behavioral changes
(Successive approximation)

Conference - - - - - Provide feedback on performance
and effect data
Specify desired change

In the planning phase of the cycle, the Trainer and I.M. plan together. They exchange full information and develop a shared understanding of the goals to be accomplished and the competencies to be demonstrated based on the objectives of the lab-clinic phase of the ComField Instructional Program.

During the observation phase the I.M. makes a provisional try by teaching a lesson which produces performance/effect data. The performance/effect data is recorded in transcript¹ form by the Trainer.

In the analysis phase, the performance/effect data are examined for patterns of behavior which characterize the performance of the goals and specific competencies agreed upon. This method of analyzing the data is based on the assumption that human behavior is patterned and therefore teaching behavior is patterned.

In the strategy phase of the cycle, the patterns of behavior are looked at and ordered by the principle of successive approximations. Prerequisite patterns are selected which are basic to subsequent achievement of more complex behavior.

In the conference phase, the purpose is not to recreate the lesson but rather to help the I.M. to gain insight into some pattern(s) in his teaching with which he can do something. The Trainer can give feedback as to the performance/effect data; however, the focus must be on the goals of the I.M. and at his current level of understanding. Replanning begins when some insight has been gained and the I.M. has something to work on for the next lesson or lessons.

Evaluation

In the model just described, the transcripts of the teaching act plus the records from the planning sessions and conferences provide solid evidence of the degree and pace of growth in the I.M.

¹Note: One may make use of video and audio records of the performance; however, for the analysis described in the next paragraph, a transcript is required.

By concentrating on patterns of behavior, one may gain evidence of true behavioral change or internalization rather than incidents which may or may not be replicable. The records would also be an excellent source for counseling and referral actions.

The planning of specific competencies to be demonstrated would be based on the criterion levels of the tasks or subtasks as defined in objectives of the laboratory phase of the ComField Instructional Program. The criterion levels for the different competencies should be defined in operational terms and the student should be able to increasingly appraise his own performance by comparing his performance with those of (a) models, (b) written criteria, and (c) the effects produced on the pupils. In the practicum, the I.M. is not only expected to perform but he is also expected to be able to explicate the knowledge base and provide a rationale for behaving as he did.

The key to evaluation is the Joint Inquiry process. The goal of evaluation ought not to be limited to a judgment as to whether or not the I.M. has reached a specified criterion level in the performance of a specific competency. The goal ought to be to promote self-analytical and self-directing I.M.'s who are capable of directing and evaluating their own performance in the future.

As the I.M. successfully demonstrates a specific competency in a specific instructional setting, the information should be fed into the data bank where it is available to the I.M., the Trainers, and the Evaluation Team who determine when the I.M. has successfully completed the Practicum.

The evaluation team is perceived as a group of Trainers, both college and school personnel, who upon meeting in staff sessions review the performance profiles of the I.M.'s for counseling and evaluation purposes and eventually determine when the I.M. has completed the practicum.

References

Cogan, Morris. Lectures at the Clinical Supervision Institute, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1964.

Hale, James R. and R. Allan Spanjer. Training Manual: Systematic and Objective Analysis of Instruction. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Portland, Oregon, 1968.

Wallen, John L. Lectures at the Clinical Supervision Institute, Portland State College, Portland, Oregon, 1965.